CONTENTS.

PAGE

Statement of Facts 1

Questions of Jurisdiction Certified by the District Court 2

Argument:

PART ONE.

The District Court Erred in Denying Appellant's Motion to Quash the Service of Summons.

I. Under common law principles the District Court had no authority to send its process outside the Northern District of Illinois; the Judicial Code, Section 51, prohibits it from entertaining jurisdiction of a civil suit against an inhabitant of the Northern District of Ohio... 4

Summary of opposing contentions..... 5

The jurisdiction of a court is available only within the territorial limitations of the district for which it is created..... 7

II. Congress, by Section 310 of the Transportation Act, did not exercise its admitted power of granting extra-territorial authority to the District Court 17

Admittedly, Congress has the power to extend the process of the District Courts beyond their territorial boundaries..... 17

PAGE

This Court has never lightly imputed to Congress an intention of discarding common law principles or a long established statutory policy. It has always demanded that the statute relied upon demonstrate such an intention in unmistakable and explicit language 18

To sustain appellee's interpretation of the statutory language here in issue it is necessary to make judicial amendments to a number of statutes 21

This court has decided that "any court" used in a statute necessarily means "any court of competent jurisdiction"..... 25

Other courts have reached the same conclusion as to the statutory meaning of "any court" 32

III. The fundamental principles of statutory construction are opposed to the interpretation of Section 310 urged by the appellee..... 38

The words "any court" having been judicially defined to mean "any court of competent jurisdiction," Congress used them in that sense in Section 310..... 39

The authority of the Railroad Labor Board can be made effective without the extraordinary interpretation contended for by the Board 41

The Labor Board's interpretation of Section 310 would result in unjustifiable inconvenience and expense to defendants. Such an interpretation will never be sustained whenever as here, the statutory language is susceptible of another equally obvious, but more reasonable interpretation 44

PAGE

When Congress has intended to extend the authority of a District Court outside its district or to alter the general venue provisions, it has always done so in explicit terms; this is demonstrated by an examination of numerous Acts of Congress..... 48

This court will avoid appellee's construction because of its effect on other Federal statutes 66

Summary and Conclusion of Part One..... 66

PART TWO.

The District Court Erred in Denying Appellant's Motion to Dismiss the Petition of the Railroad Labor Board.

I. The Petition Prays for an Order to Compel Respondent (Appellant) to Appear and Testify before the Railroad Labor Board, which would Deprive Him of Liberty and Property Without Due Process of Law in Violation of the Fifth Amendment 71

To compel testimony is to deprive the witness of liberty and property. Such deprivation to be constitutional must be justified by a corresponding public benefit..... 71

Because of the social interest in the administration of justice, the compulsion of testimony in the determination or enforcement of legal rights involves no unconstitutional deprivation 72

This principle determines the limits of the duty to testify in the courts..... 73

PAGE

The duty to testify before legislative bodies is limited in accordance with similar principles 83

The Supreme Court has decided that administrative bodies cannot compel testimony unless thereby legal rights are determined or enforced 89

The Brimson Case so holds..... 90

The Harriman Case so holds..... 97

Federal Trade Commission Cases discussed 101

Pacific Railway Commission Case discussed 105

Applying the foregoing principles and precedents, it is evident that for a court to compel the giving of testimony before the Railroad Labor Board would be unconstitutional 112

II. The Petition of the Railroad Labor Board Did not Invoke "Judicial Power" to Determine a "Case" or "Controversy" Within the Limitations of Article III of the Constitution..... 118

The judicial power does not extend to proceedings such as those before the Railroad Labor Board, in which no legal rights can be determined 119

Congress cannot extend the judicial power to matters which are not subject to judicial cognizance 124

Interstate Commerce Commission precedents have no application to the Railroad Labor Board 125

Summary of Argument on Judicial Power..... 131

PAGE

III. The Petition Calls upon the Court to Participate in the Formulation of a Public Policy, Contrary to Ancient Principles 135

The function of the Railroad Labor Board is to formulate public opinion 135

The courts, from time immemorial, have refused to participate in any way in the political function of formulating public opinion .. 138

Conclusion 143

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.

PAGE

Abbotsford v. Johnson, 98 U. S. 440 39

Acts of Congress:

Act of September 24, 1789, c. 20, 1 Stat. 79 (Judiciary Act) 8, 10, 13, 18, 19, 34, 40

Act of March 2, 1793, c. 22, 1 Stat. 335; R. S. 918 (Rule-making power of courts) 30

Act of March 2, 1793, c. 22, 1 Stat. 335; R. S. 876 (Subpoenas for witnesses) 52

Act of March 3, 1797, c. 20, 1 Stat. 515; R. S. 986 (Writs of execution) 16, 53

Act of February 19, 1799, Secs. 1 and 2, 1 Stat. 617 ..... 61n

Act of March 3, 1799, Sec. 17, 1 Stat. 743, 748.. 61n

Act of May 20, 1826, c. 124, 4 Stat. 184; R. S. 985 (Writs of Execution) 53

Act of August 23, 1842; R. S. 917 30

Act of March 3, 1849, 9 Stat. 410 ..... 61n

Act of March 3, 1851, c. 43, 9 Stat. L. 635; R. S. 4283, 4284 (Limitation of Vessel-Owner Liability) 20, 25, 27, 31, 39

Act of January 24, 1857, c. 19, 11 Stat. 155; R. S. 102 86

Act of May 4, 1858, Secs. 1 and 2, 11 Stat. 272.. 61n

Act of June 30, 1864, c. 173, 13 Stat. 238; R. S. 3177 20

Act of July 8, 1870, c. 230, 16 Stat. 204; R. S. 4906 56

Act of May 21, 1872, c. 177, 17 Stat. 136; R. S. 2103 .....32, 34, 35

Act of June 1, 1872, c. 255, 17 Stat. 198; R. S. 1042 37

Act of March 3, 1873, 17 Stat. 508 54

Act of June 4, 1880, Sec. 2, 21 Stat. 155 ..... 62n

Act of June 14, 1880, 21 Stat. 198 ..... 62n

Act of June 26, 1884, c. 121, Sec. 18, 23 Stat. 57. 20

PAGE

Act of August 2, 1886, c. 840, 24 Stat. 209 (Oleomargarine Tax) 20

Act of February 4, 1887, c. 104; 24 Stat. 379, as amended (Interstate Commerce Act):

Section 12.....42, 62, 63, 64-91, 92, 94, 101

Section 16 89

Act of March 3, 1887, Sec. 2, 24 Stat. 488..... 106

Act of March 3, 1887, c. 373, Sec. 1, 24 Stat. 552 (Venue) 14, 31, 34

Act of July 2, 1890, c. 647, 26 Stat. 209 (Sherman Act):

Section 4 49

Section 5 49

Act of July 5, 1892, Sec. 4, 27 Stat. 72, 73..... 62n

Act of December 28, 1892, 27 Stat. 409, c. 14.... 120

Act of July 12, 1894, 28 Stat. 102..... 62n

Act of July 18, 1894, Sec. 4, 28 Stat. 115..... 62n

Act of May 4, 1898, 30 Stat. 397..... 62n

Act of March 2, 1901, c. 800, 31 Stat. 877, Sec. 4 (Spanish Claims Act) 60

Act of August 5, 1904, 36 Stat. 112 (Corporation Tax Act) 57

Act of March 4, 1909, c. 320, 35 Stat. 1084 (Copyright Act) 52

Act of April 5, 1910, c. 143, 36 Stat. 291..... 20

Act of April 12, 1910, 36 Stat. 29..... 62n

Act of March 3, 1911, c. 231, 36 Stat. 1100 (Judicial Code):

Section 24 19

Section 43 57

Section 44 58

Section 45 57

Section 48 56

Section 49 55

Section 51 .....4, 18

Act of August 23, 1912, c. 351, 37 Stat. 415 (Comm. Industrial Relations) 138

PAGE

Act of July 15, 1913, c. 6, 38 Stat. 103, Sec. 5 (Newlands Act) 61

Act of October 22, 1913, 38 Stat. 219 (District Court Jurisdiction Act) 51

Act of September 26, 1914, c. 311, 38 Stat. 717 (Federal Trade Commission Act):

Section 5 .....51, 105

Section 6. .....103, 105

Section 9 .....50, 101, 103, 105

Section 10 105

Act of October 15, 1914, c. 323, 38 Stat. 730: (Clayton Act):

Section 13 49

Section 15 50

Act of September 8, 1916, 39 Stat. 756 (Revenue Act) 60

Act of September 8, 1916, Title VII, 39 Stat. 797 (Tariff Commission) 61

Act of February 5, 1917, 39 Stat. 886 (Immigration Inspection Act) 61

Act of March 22, 1919, c. 80, 41 Stat. 300, Sec. 105 (D. of C. Rent Act)..... 58

Act of February 28, 1920, c. 91, 41 Stat. 472, as amended by Act of June 5, 1920, c. 235, Title III (Transportation Act) 113, 114, 115, 127

Section 307 (b) 134

Section 308 (2) 41

Section 310.....5, 40, 45, 48, 63, 95, 101, 131, 134

Section 313 135

Act of March 9, 1920, Sec. 2, 41 Stat. 528..... 62n

Act of June 5, 1920, c. 250, 41 Stat. 988 (Merchant Marine) 19, 20

Act of June 10, 1920, c. 285, 41 Stat. 1063, Sec. 4 (Water Power Act) 58

Act of February 18, 1922, c. 57, 42 Stat. 388 (Capper-Volstead Act) 57

Act of September 19, 1922, c. 344, 42 Stat. 849 (Subpoenas for Witnesses).....53, 62n

PAGE

Act of September 21, 1922, c. 369, 42 Stat. 998, Sec. 6 (B) (Grain Futures Act) 61
Act of September 22, 1922, c. 412, 42 Stat. 1023 (Coal Commission) 59, 138

Act of V. Eliz., c. 9, Sec. 12 (1562) 73
Acts of VII and VIII William III, c. 3, Sec. 7 (1695) 75
Adams v. Field, 21 Vt. 256 39
American Banana Co. v. United Fruit Co., 213 U. S. 347 140
American Decisions, Vol. 100, p. 515 73
Anderson v. Dunn, 6 Wheat. 204 ..... 88n
Attorney General, Matter of, 21 N. Y. Misc. 101 82
Augusta, etc., Railroad v. Randolph, 85 Ga. 297 79

Bacon, Abridgement, "Statute" I 39
Bacon, Maxims, Reg. 10, Spedding, Vol. VII, 356 .. 48
Barnes, *Ex parte*, 73 Tex. Cr. 583 73
Bennett v. Waller, 23 Ill. 97 77
Bentham, Draft for a Judicial Establishment, Works of Bentham, Bowring's Ed., IV, 320 78
Blair v. United States, 250 U. S. 273 .....73, 75, 76
Bloomer v. McQuewan, 14 How. 539 47
Board of Commissioners v. Markle, 46 Ind. 96 36
Bogardus v. Trinity Church, 4 Sandf. Ch. 633 39
Borden v. Enterprise Transportation Company, 195 U. S. 590 38
Bourke v. Amison, 32 Fed. 710 .....15, 64
Boyd v. United States, 116 U. S. 616 .....108, 133
Brotherhood of Clerks v. Pennsylvania Railroad, 294 Fed. 556 114
Brotherhood of Clerks *et al.* v. Pennsylvania Railroad, Nos. 3118, 3140, C. C. A., Second Circuit, March Term, 1924 115
Brown v. Barry, 3 Dall. 365 46
Bunkers, *Ex parte*, 1 Calif. App. 61 88
Burdette v. Abbott, 14 East. 1 85
Burnham v. Morrissey, 14 Gray (Mass.) 226 88
Butler v. Boston & S. S. S. Co., 139 U. S. 527 20

PAGE

Cathcart v. Robinson, 5 Pet. 280 39
Cely v. Griffin, 113 Fed. 981 ..... 15, 16
Chambers v. Oehler, 107 Ia. 155 ..... 74, 80
Chapman, *In re*, 166 U. S. 661 86
Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia, 5 Pet. 1 140
Claire Furnace Company v. Federal Trade Commission, 285 Fed. 936 104
Clem v. The State, 33 Ind. 418 37
Cohen, *Ex parte*, 104 Cal. 524 73
Cohen v. Virginia, 6 Wheat. 264 120
Coke, Institutes, Vol. 2, p. 200 46
Commercial Trust Co. v. Miller, 262 U. S. 51 140
Commissioner of Patents v. Whitely, 4 Wall. 522 .. 140
Commonwealth v. Barry, 98 Ky. 394 79
Commonwealth v. Hartnett, 3 Gray 450 39
Congressional Record:
Vol. 58, Part 1-9, p. 8503 136
Vol. 58, Part 1-9, p. 8508 136
Vol. 59, Part 4, p. 3334 135
Constitution of the United States:
Article III 59, 70, 109, 118, 120
Fourth Amendment 86, 101
Fifth Amendment 69, 71, 74, 83, 86, 124
Sixth Amendment 59
Countess of Rothes v. Commissioners (1882), 7 A. C. 694 47
Countess of Shrewsbury's Case, 2 How. S. T. Tr. 769 73
Crosby, Case of, Lord Mayor, 3 Wils. 188 85

Dansereau, *Ex parte*, XIX, Lower Can. Jurist, 210 .. 88
D'Arcy v. Ketchum, 11 How. 165 16
Daugherty, *Ex parte*, 229 Fed. 620 ..... 87, 88n
Davies, In the Matter of, 168 N. Y. 89 ..... 73, 75, 76
Davis v. Wakelee, 156 U. S. 680 16
Den *ex dem.* Murray v. Hoboken Land Improvement Company, 18 How. 272 ..... 121, 124

PAGE

Digest, Lib. 2 Tit. 1, L. 20 7
Draft for a Judicial Establishment, Bentham, Works of, Vol. IV, p. 320 77
Dudley v. McCord, 65 Ia. 671 74-80
Duke of York's Claim to the Crown, 5 Rotuli, Par. 275 ..... 138, 142

East River Towing Co., Matter of the Petition of, U. S. Sup. Ct., Adv. Ops. p. 130, Oct. Term, 1924 .. 19
Ellis v. Interstate Commerce Commission, 237 U. S. 434 63
Elwell v. Gieber, 33 Fed. 71 32
Emery's Case, 107 Mass. 172 88
Encyclopedia of Pleading and Practice, Vol. 20, p. 1111 16
Endlich, Interpretation of Statutes, par. 178 47
English v. Smock, 34 Ind. 115 ..... 36, 37
Enterprise, The, 196 Fed. 404 30
Entick v. Carrington, 19 How. St. Tr. 1029 108

Falvey, *In re*, 7 Wis. 630 88
Federal Trade Commission v. American Tobacco Co., Adv. Ops. U. S. Sup. Ct., Oct. Term, 1923, p. 382 ..... 101, 126
Federal Trade Commission v. Baltimore Grain Company, 284 Fed. 886 102
Fenton v. Hampton, 11 Moore P. C. (Van Dieman's Land) 88
Fidelity Trust Company v. Norfolk Railroad Company, 90 Fed. 175 46
Finkelstein, Judicial Self Limitation, Harvard Law Review, Vol. 37, p. 338 ..... 138n
Fiske v. Henarie, 142 U. S. 459 12
Foster, Federal Practice, Sec. 427 15
Frankfurter and Landis, Power of Congress over Procedure in Criminal Contempts, Harvard Law Review, Vol. 37, p. 1010 ..... 89n
Frothingham v. Mellon, 262 U. S. 447 142

PAGE

Galer v. Wilder, 10 How. 477 65
Gompers v. United States, 233 U. S. 604 64
Graham, *Ex parte*, 3 Wash. 456 ..... 9, 15, 23
Granada County v. Brogden, 112 U. S. 261 47
Graustein v. Rutland Railroad Company, 256 Fed. 409 67
Griffin v. Ranney, 25 Conn. 239 38
Grover, etc., Company v. Florence, etc., Company, 18 Wall. 553 39

Hale v. Henkel, 201 U. S. 43 82
Harkness v. Hyde, 98 U. S. 476 10
Harland v. Telephone Company, 40 Fed. 308 13
Harriman v. Interstate Commerce Commission, 211 U. S. 408 ..... 47, 63, 64, 69, 96, 97, 101, 117, 126, 128
Harvard Law Review:
Vol. 24, p. 587 82
Vol. 37, p. 338 ..... 138n
Vol. 37, p. 1013, n 89n
Vol. 38, p. 235 87
Hayburn's Case, 2 Dall. 409 130
Henry v. Henkel, 235 U. S. 219 86
Herndon v. Ridgway, 17 How. 424 34
Herreshoff v. Knietsch, 127 Fed. 492 79
Hooper v. California, 155 U. S. 648 47
Howat v. Kansas, 258 U. S. 181 ..... 117n

Interstate Commerce Commission v. Baird, 194 U. S. 25 63
Interstate Commerce Commission v. Brimson, 154 U. S. 447 ..... 44, 63, 90, 91, 93, 96, 101, 106, 125, 126, 127
Interstate Commerce Commission v. United States, 224 U. S. 474 ..... 142n

Jackson v. Mobley, 157 Ala. 408 74
Jenks, *Ex parte*, 141 Ala. 429 79

PAGE

Johnson v. Southern Railway Company, 117 Fed. 462 46
Jones v. Guarantee Company, 101 U. S. 626..... 48

Kepner v. United States, 195 U. S. 100..... 39
Kilbourn v. Thompson, 103 U. S. 168....83, 86, 109, 141
King Alexander Jannaeus, Case of, Tractatus, Sanhedrin, 19a 138n
Kingdom of Roumania v. Guaranty Trust Co., 244 Fed. 195 140
Knights Templars & M. Life Indemnity Co. v. Jarman, 187 U. S. 205.....47, 100

La Abra Mining Company v. United States, 175 U. S. 423 120
Landers v. Woodward, 2 Can. S. C. R. 158 (Nova Scotia) 88
Lathrop v. Clapp, 40 N. Y. 328..... 73
Latimer v. United States, 223 U. S. 501..... 39
Lawyers' Reports Annotated (N. S.), Vol. 51, p. 1155 73
Lessee of Brewer v. Blougher, 14 Pet. 178..... 24
Lewis' Sutherland, Statutory Construction, Vol. II, Sec. 573 46
Louisville, etc., Packet Company, *In re*, 223 Fed. 185 .....26, 30
Louisville Underwriters, *In re*, 134 U. S. 488..... 31
Lowe v. Sumner, 69 Mo. App. 637..... 88
Luckenback, The, 26 Fed. 870..... 32
Luther v. Borden, 7 How. 1.....70, 139

Mary Lord, The, 31 Fed. 416..... 32
Mason v. Fearson, 9 How. 248..... 39
Mattler v. Shaffner, 53 Ind. 245..... 36
Maynard Coal Company v. Federal Trade Commission, Sup. Ct. D. of C., April 19, 1920..... 104
McCarthy, *Ex parte*, 29 Calif. 295..... 88
McCool v. Smith, 1 Black. 469..... 39
McKee v. United States, 164 U. S. 287..... 65

PAGE

Michigan Law Review, June, 1924, "Fishing Expeditions by Commissions" 104
Mining Co. v. Utilities Co., 26 Ida. 391.....117n
Mitchell v. Dexter, 244 Fed. 926..... 14
Mossman v. Forrest, 27 Ind. 233..... 36
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U. S. 113..... 74
Murray's Lessee v. Baker, 3 Wheat. 541..... 65

Nabob of the Carnatic v. East India Company, 1 Ves. Jr. 270, 2 Ves. Jr. 56..... 139
New York, N. H. and H. Railroad Company v. Interstate Commerce Commission, 200 U. S. 361..... 43
Norwich and New York Transportation Co. v. Wright, 13 Wall. 104.....28, 29

Oates v. First National Bank, 100 U. S. 239..... 65
Oetjen v. Central Leather Co., 246 U. S. 297..... 140
Osborn v. Bank of United States, 9 Wheat. 738....70, 121

Pacific Railway Commission, *In re,* 32 Fed. 241...88, 105
Palmer v. Thompson, 20 App. D. C. 273.....14, 15
Panama Railroad v. Johnson, 264 U. S. 375.....18, 20
Parker, *Ex parte,* 74 S. C. 466..... 88
Patterson v. Winn, 11 Wheat 380..... 48
Peacock v. Bell, 1 Saund. 73..... 36
Pennock v. Dialogue, 2 Pet. 18..... 39
Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U. S. 714..... 16
People *ex rel.* McMahon v. Board of Excise, 3 N. Y. S. 253 37
People v. Keeler, 99 N. Y. 219..... 87
People v. Sanford, 236 Mo. 665..... 117n
Pennsylvania Company, *In re,* 137 U. S. 451..... 12
Pennsylvania Railroad Co. v. Railroad Labor Board, 261 U. S. 72 .....69, 112, 117, 119, 135, 136
Phenix Insurance Co., *Ex parte,* 118 U. S. 610..... 27
Phillips, Matter of, 70 N. Y. Misc. 8..... 82
Picquet v. Swan, 5 Mason 35.....7, 8, 12, 15, 45
Plunkett v. Hamilton, 136 Ga. 72..... 117n

PAGE

Porto Rico v. Rosali, 227 U. S. 279..... 140
Potter's Dwarris, Statutory Construction, 274..... 39
Prentis v. Atlantic Coast Line, 211 U. S. 210..... 89
Presser v. Illinois, 116 U. S. 252..... 47

Raymond v. Topson, 22 Chan. 430..... 74
Reams v. The State, 23 Ind. 111..... 37
Reg. v. Morris (1867), L. R. I. C. R. 90..... 46
Reg. v. Overseers, 13 Q. B. D. 339..... 47
Rex v. Baines, 25 T. L. R. 79.....74, 80
Ricaud v. American Metal Co., 246 U. S. 304..... 140
Rigg v. Wilton, 13 Ill. 15..... 39
Robinson v. Philadelphia & Reading Railroad Co., 28 Fed. 340..... 79
Ruckmaboye v. Mottichund, 32 Eng. L. & E. 84.... 39
Rugdai, The, 278 Fed. 294..... 140
Rules of Practice in Admiralty, Rule 54, Rule 57 .....29, 30, 31
Ruling Case Law, Volume 28, p. 419, Sec. 3..... 73
Ryan v. Carter, 93 U. S. 78..... 48

Schooner Exchange v. McFaddon, 7 Cranch 116.... 140
Shaw v. National Bank, 101 U. S. 557..... 46
Sheriff of Middlesex, Case of the, 11 Ad. and E. 273 85
Simkins, Federal Equity Suit, p. 310..... 16
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U. S. 700..... 70
Slayton, *Ex parte*, 105 U. S. 451.....26, 28
Smith v. Adams, 130 U. S. 173.....70, 94, 110, 118, 121
Smith v. Interstate Commerce Commission, 245 U. S. 33 .....63, 100, 126
Smith v. Lyon, 133 U. S. 315..... 11
State v. Brewster, 89 N. J. L. 665..... 88
State *ex rel.* Wildman v. Vanderburgh County, 49 Ind. 457.....36, 37
State v. Frazier, 182 N. W. 551..... 88n
State v. Frear, 138 Wis. 173..... 88
State v. Howat, 107 Kan. 423..... 117n

PAGE

State v. Klene, 276 Mo. 206 ..... 117n
State v. Lloyd, 152 Wis. 24 ..... 117n
State v. Scott, 89 N. J. L. 658 88
State v. Turnpike Co., 65 N. J. L. 73 38
Story, Conflict of Laws, Chapter I, Sec. 8 7
Stout v. Grant Company, 107 Ind. 343 48
Sullivan v. Hill, 73 W. Va. 49 88
Supreme Court in United States History, Warren, Vol. 2, p. 460 139
Surgett v. Lapice, 8 How. 48 43
System Federation No. 90 v. Pennsylvania Railroad, 296 Fed. 220 114

Taft, Chief Justice, Address in Memoriam Chief Justice White, 257 U. S. xxv-xxvi 89n, 132
Taylor v. Connor, 7 Ind. 115 37
Tiago Railroad v. Blossburg, 20 Wall. 137 16
Toland v. Sprague, 12 Pet. 300 ..... 7, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 34
Totten v. United States, 92 U. S. 105 79

Union Trust & Savings Bank v. Telephone Company, 258 Ill. 202 141
United States *ex rel.* McIntosh v. Crawford, 47 Fed. 561 32
United States v. Barnes, 222 U. S. 513 ..... 19, 20, 21
United States v. Basic Products Company, 260 Fed. 472 103
United States v. Fisher, 2 Cranch 358 40-48
United States v. Freeman, 3 How. 556 48
United States v. Fullhart, 47 Fed. 802 15
United States v. Goldenberg, 168 U. S. 103 22
United States v. Kirby, 7 Wall. 482 ..... 24, 35
United States v. Mayes, 12 Wall. 177 43
United States v. Mills, 11 App. D. of C. 500 37
United States v. Mooney, 116 U. S. 104 39
United States v. Union Pacific Railroad Company, 98 U. S. 601 ..... 34, 35

PAGE

United States v. Sinclair, Sup. Ct. D. of C., July 14, 1924 86
United States v. Sweet, 245 U. S. 563..... 21

Vane v. Newcombe, 132 U. S. 220..... 48
Vanriper v. Vanriper, 3 Lanc. L. Rev. 155..... 78

Walker v. Lea, 47 Fed. 645..... 15
Wallace v. Elec. Co., 41 N. D. 418..... 117n
Walters, *Ex parte*, 64 Texas Cr. 238..... 88
Walters v. Seattle, etc., Railway Company, 48 Wash. 233 78
Waters v. Trust Company, 126 Fed. 471..... 16
Warren, Supreme Court in United States History, Vol. 2, p. 460..... 139
Wertheim v. Continental Railway, 15 Fed. 116..... 77
West Rand Central Gold Mining Company, Ltd., v. The King (1905), 2 K. B. 391..... 139
West v. State, 1 Wis. 209..... 77
While v. Conover, 5 Blackf. 462..... 36
Whitcomb's Case, 120 Mass. 118..... 88
Wigmore: Evidence, Secs. 2175, 2192, 2193..... 73
Williams, Jurisdiction and Practice of Federal Courts, c. 2, s. 12..... 16
Williams v. State, 125 Ark. 285..... 73
Wisner, *Ex parte*, 203 U. S. 449..... 11
Witmer v. Dist. Ct., 155 Ia. 244..... 117n
Wulfsohn v. Russian Soviet Socialist Federated Republic, 234 N. Y. 372..... 140

Yoe v. Hoffman, 61 Kan. 265..... 88
Yorkshire Insurance Company v. Clayton, 8 Q. B. D. 421 39
Young & Company v. Mayor (1883), 8 A. C. 517.... 39